GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION
GTU LIBRARY
1962

THE VORTEX

When boatmen approach the outer rim of a whirlpool there is a certain stretch of time when by hard rowing they may escape being drawn to destruction. But when that is passed all effort is in vain. Has the Eisenhower-Dulles boat, in which we are all passengers, run out of this precious stretch of time?

Mountains of Republican brains labored at the preparation of the speech which President Eisenhower recently read at a publishers' convention. It was to be the answer to Malenkov. It was to inaugurate the New American Policy. It was to take the initiative from the Russians, particularly with reference to peace which had become their world-monopoly propaganda-wise.

The chef on whose recipe this 'peace' speech was reputedly based is one of the editors of Life magazine whose name, somebody has suggested, should be Death magazine, for it has been doing little else than screaming for war ever since the end of World War II.

The man who read it is the same General Eisenhower who said as recently as Aug. 25, 1952, "Our Government...must tell the Kremlin that we shall never recognize the slightest permanence in Russia's position in Eastern Europe and Asia."

His Secretary of State who, in rather unseemly haste, appeared to be blanketing the President's speech with one of his own, had said in May, 1952, "We could make it clear ...that US policy seeks as one of its peaceful goals the eventual restoration of genuine independence in the nations of Europe and Asia now dominated by Moscow..."

The bible, the mein kampf, of Washington, before, during, and after the inauguration of this great New American Policy of 'peace', is a book by James Burnham, "Containment or Liberation", which says that liberation (by the physical invasion of war) is the only defense against Soviet world victory.

It is necessary also to mention the fascist fringe (fast becoming much more than a fringe) of Washington, unrepudiated by the Administration, which could under circumstances favoring such events be catapulted into the seat of power.

With these things in mind let us look at the President's utterance, praised as it is by the Tory leader, Churchill and by the labor leaders of both CIO and AFL in the USA. Let us ask about this speech what our commentators always chorus about any speech by any Russian: Is there anything new in it?

According to Walter Lippmann the big news about it was that "it liquidates the doctrine of unconditional surrender." That was the 'hard core' he says. But such a liquidation can only be meaningful when made by a victor whose heel is on the throat of the vanquished, hardly the situation of the USA or of the West as a whole in its attempts to repress the rising peoples of the colonial world. Nor is such a situation foreseeable at the moment. So the big gesture is hardly in place.

But even supposing the USA were in the position of victor and could therefor indulge such flights of magnanimity, is not the alternative and the only alternative to unconditional surrender a thing called negotiation? Where then in this speech is room indicated for negotiation?

The Soviet bloc is told that it must retreat, it must go back behind its borders. The first step towards peace, it says, must be "the conclusion of an honorable armistice in Korea" and "no less importantly—an end to the direct and indirect attacks upon the security of Indochina and Malaya." Thus the refusal of the peoples of Korea, Indochina and Malaya to remain the servitors of economic imperialism is construed to mean an attack upon the security of these nations by Moscow.

The President goes further and ties up these demands with a demand for the "full independence of the East European nations." In this connection he laments that the European Recovery Program of 1947 "was prepared to treat, with like and equal concern, the needs of Eastern and Western Europe." This was drawing a very long bow, as ERP was conceived and carried out as an anti-Soviet measure, whereas Russia is an East European nation.

Gen. Eisenhower laid down no formal ultimatum, yet he intimated clearly enough that The Soviet Union must smooth the path of colonial exploitation for the West or else they

must look forward to an indefinite continuation of the cold war, or to atomic war.

Well? What's new here? The recital of how many schoolhouses go into a warship? Ever since the founding of the Hague Court schoolboys have been doing those sums of long division. Does the American bloc, insofar as it is represented by this speech, propose to make peace with the Soviet bloc? Yes, if the Soviet bloc will commit suicide. But even here there's a fly in the ointment. Says Lippmann:

"Once again we find ourselves long on objectives and short on policies, plans and measures for getting to the objectives. This has been the chronic weakness of our foreign policy throughout the twentieth century. Now, because the State Department is for all the practical purposes of grand strategy and grand statesmanship paralyzed with fear and uncertainty, the weakness is worse than it ever was."

Of course it is the frankly antidemocratic and blatantly fascist element which paralyzes the State Department. It 'grand strategy and grand statesmanship' is not at all grand enough for the McCarthys. How distressing this must be to Secretary Dulles who had a good right to anticipate help rather than hindrance from them. But t'was ever thus.

For it is impossible to play at fascism, to flirt with fascism, to move toward it just so far and then to stop and argue that after all you want to be a gentleman and you never realized what depths of degradation and bestiality were involved in this war against Communism. When you try to do that the fascists pull you willy-nilly right over to their side. No you don't, they say, you don't eat your cake and have it. You talked in Seoul of the 'grand design'. Fine Churchillian talk. But less than half of one of the smallest countries in the world has you beaten to a standstill. Is that your grand design? Is that all that democracy can do? If so, we'll have done with democracy. We'll crack the whip of fascism. The Bill of Rights we'll use as a spittoon. We'll break your pretty facade of bi-partisan politics wide open and do what you can only dream of doing: rule this country with an army, a gestapo and a one-party heiling congress, all wrapped up in the Flag.

That is the pressure from without, from the so-called lunatic fringe which is neither more nor less lunatic than the long list of European fascist dictatorships (some of whom are still operating and now allies of the USA). But there is also the pressure from within, more powerful, more sinister, issuing from life-long habits of thinking in terms of money (Dulles) and fame (Eisenhower). It comes from gnawing ambition and illusive vanity.

These characteristics showed themselves when the soldier allowed himself to be persuaded that he could be a college president and when the lawyer tried to get elected as a senator and in a berserk moment of frustration threatened the USA with a fascist revolution. In their places, one as a soldier, the other as a lawyer, they are competent enough. Out of place, where they now are, both are baffled and self-defeated. Seldom have we seen such looks of utter bewilderment as in the unposed photographs of the President. And when Dulles is present with the boss he thinks he is bossing his eagerness to get into camera focus is pathetic

There is a difference between them, however, and on this difference we may build a slight hope for a return to a semblance of sanity. Ike is shrewd in his way, but compared with Dulles he is a barefoot country boy. Moreover, neglecting for the moment the methods by which he was elected, he was elected President of the American people. Yes, money sold him, but Ike, the broad grin, the midwestern folksiness, the glory of high command, was something that could be sold. He has what Dulles couldn't get, with all his connections, the 'mandate of the people.' Dulles, issuing from the murky canyons of Wall Street, a responsible agent of big money, has much to gain and little to lose in the way of reputation. He has gone to great lengths to wash the aroma of nazism off himself, even becoming a leader in church circles through his association with Rockefeller, the angel of ecumenicism. He still gives lectures to ministers' gatherings on international morals. He once circulated a mimeographed statement decontaminating himself from past nazi and fascist connections.

Now the hope is that Dulles' slyness may get the better of him once too often and that he may get himself fired by the President. The most recent case of this was when he told newsme that a likely condition of peace in Korea would be to divide that country at 'the waist' or 90 miles north of the present battle line. Such a provocative suggestion made at the very

moment when 'peace' was being spread around was tricky, too tricky. He obviously made it as super-insurance against the bare possibility that the Russians might through a feat of ju-jutsu, backed by world opinion, actually bring about the threat of genuine peace. He didn't need to do it. There were plenty of other wild men around to throw spanners into any real peace move. He just couldn't resist making sure.

The needs of both sides of the cold war coincide at the moment. Soviet need of peace is basic, permanent. US need of peace is temporary. It is of the back-up-the-better-to-leap-forward type. It is supported by Humphrey of the Treasury, by the group determined to carry out the pledge to lower taxes, and by such soldiers as Bradley who realize that the USA is militarily over-committed.

This common need for peace, or, let us say, for peace on the one hand and truce on the other, if it materializes, may be the last chance for all of us to pick up the oars and row hard to escape being drawn into the vortex of the whirlpool.

Such a truce will not come about if the Dulles boys can help it. And if it does they will make it as short and uneasy as possible. Their present powerful and strategic positions in the government are a guarantee that any peace or truce will be wrecked.

For the architects of ruin in our government partake of the nature of the whirlpool that sucks at our civilization. They are perfectly aware that even a moderate period of peace will reveal the inadequacies of cartel capitalism to satisfy the needs and demands of human beings. Long ago they have given hostages to fortune. For them there is no retreat. At the center of their souls is the vacuum that would draw, and will draw, if we permit it, us all to Hell. Such men and the ecumenical church which lifts them on high for all men to follow are corrupted with the same moral rot.

We have a letter from the Rev. Don Chase of Crescent City, California, a reader of the Protestant for over a decade. He announces that "this is the end of the road" and asks that his name be removed from our mailing list. Why? Because, he writes, "I have had no doubts since June, 1950 that, whatever there was to say for Red China, there was no excuse for aggression against South Korea (and I don't admire Rhee). No amount of double-talk can convince me that the UN did not have to do what it did."

Now we might argue with Don Chase. We might go the second mile with him and agree that the UN had a right to be interested to the point of involvement in the disturbance in Korea. And we might ask him what there was so special about this case that made it necessary for the USA to hustle the UN into an intemperate and hastily-conceived act, an act of war under the smoke and excitement of which it would not be noticed that another act, unilateral, unauthorized, was launched by the hustler, an act of aggression against China through Formosa. Surely Don Chase should have believed the evidence of our own public records as to all this. Nobody hid it. It was simply not noticed in the excitement of the "war to defend the UN." But the whole premise and charter of the UN were broken and scattered to the four winds by this 'war to defend the UN." Our publicists even boasted about it. They began to blurt it right out that this was a war against Communism. Since the Communist countries were a party to the founding of the UN and since peace between Communist and Capitalist countries (as expressed in the principle of unanimity in its chief executive body) was the very precondition of its existence how then could the UN be defended by a war on Communism? Yet Don Chase says he will not be taken in by double-talk. He might answer that according to us it should be impossible for the UN to discipline Communist nations. And we might remind him of the time the UN did discipline Russia herself in the matter of her keeping troops in Iran beyond the time for their withdrawal. But the argument would, we fear, convince nobody.

What has happened to the Don Chases of this continent? They are honest liberals. They truly long for world peace. What makes it so easy for a clever lawyer to mislead them? In our opinion it is platonic Christianity, a Christianity of formulae unintegrated with life. It was unknown to Jesus. It only came into being when the churches made their capitulation to 'worldly' forces and became partners in empire.

When the rich man joined the church, not to rid himself of his riches, but to safeguard his riches, the church became the guardian of wealth and the bulwark of privileged power. As for the lawyer, Dulles, whom the church chose as its mentor and guide in international affairs, he is only one of many. We have no wish to set him up as a special incubus or demon.

He simply happens to be a focus of many forces of corruption that, in accordance with God's law (let our atheist brethren call it a law of moral gravity or whatever they like) bring low a great nation.

Don Chase doesn't admire Rhee. Yet many northerners did admire Jefferson Davis, but fought for the Union against the slave-holding seceders. The crucial thing to keep in mind is that from the day the first slaver dragged men and women from the shores of Africa right up until the Civil War there had proceeded a constant relentless war against the African peop The same thing is true of Korea. There a war as cruel, perhaps more cruel, was proceeding under American auspices in South Korea during the entire period prior to the UN 'police action'. Far more casualties were inflicted before June 1950 on South Korean tradeunionists and liberals by Rhee than have been suffered in battle by UN forces since that time. In one little island, Chiju-Do 10,000 out of 30,000 houses were destroyed and 2,750 of the inhabitants were killed. This is on the testimony of E. A. J. Johnson, director of ECA's Korean division. We could quote the further testimony of the United Nations Commission on Korea, ECA labor adviser, Stanley Earl, Burton E. Martin, an educational adviser, also Hugh Deane of th N.Y. Compass, also the correspondent of the N.Y. Herald Tribune, to the effect that what we falsely called the cold war had been using gunpowder and bayonets in Korea and that Rhee's regime was an UNDECLARED WAR against his people. It is not enough to withold admiration from Rhee.

And here is the depth of the evil. Through the church's inherent weakness it had created a climate of respect, almost of reverence, for the rich and the powerful, a climate in which there began to appear haloes around the heads of rich benefactors. Benefactors? Better call them malefactors, for their money and their yen for uniformity stripped the Protestant churches of what little independence they retained, and turned them into a public relations instrument for the cartels, fatuous, ruthless, full to the neck with falsehood and hypocrisy.

Prostitution occurs at many levels. When it reaches those who preach the good news of Jesus it has reached the center, the foundation of our life. The Don Chases are innocents. The Dulles's know what they do. And they seem to prosper for a moment, but, to quote an old Greek chorus:

> Heavy is the murmur of an angry prople
> Performing the purpose of a public curse...
> For the gods are not blind to the
> Murderers of many, and the black
> Furies, in time,
> When a man prospers in sin,
> By erosion of life reduce him to darkness,
> Who, once among the lost, can no more
> Be helped.

Who Shall Help the People?

Writing in the New Republic (1/5/53) the distinguished philosopher, Lewis Mumford, asked: "Who better than Adlai Stevenson can awaken our country to the grave reality of this situation? ...And once we awaken he may likewise aid us in producing bolder plans with more human purposes, plans that will not merely terminate the Cold War but lift from our threatened youth the nightmare of a meaningless sacrifice for an ultimately meaningless—because nihilistic—goal." Mumford praise the quick candor and moral discrimination of Adlai, which made him realize that in this man "we felt close once more to the core of the American tradition." "He seemed to banish self-induced fear, malevolent suspicion, scurrilous accusation, irrational hatred..." Listening to this new voice Mumford heard the ring of Emerson, Whitman, Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson. But listen to what another man heard.

During the 1952 elections James L. Brewer, whom our readers will remember for his smashing attack on the Smith Act (Protestant, vol. VIII, no.11) wrote us a letter from which we shall quote at some length, as being relevant to the present great need of the American people for help and guidance:

"Fifty years ago Theodore Roosevelt voiced alarm that the American society was moving toward 'Armageddon' under a menace of what he termed 'malefactors of great wealth.'"

"The interval since," continues Brewer, "as one of vast, plutocratic accretion of the same direction, seems actually today to have culminated in crisis of real Armageddon

reckoning, 'the great day of God', in confrontation in life-and-death struggle of titanic, divisive world forces, namely, of a vested capitalism and a challenging socialism, basically of transcendent spiritual and moral import."

The letter then goes on to discuss Gov. Stevenson. But, before quoting further, let us ask why it is so important to go back to the late elections and examine Gen. Eisenhower's alternative. After all, it was the American people who got themselves into their present embarrassing position where they find themselves without guidance or leadership and where the plutocracy they have placed in political office stumble and fall into new traps every day, mostly traps of their own setting. And it is the American people who will have to get themselves out.

That is why we must look back and see where they permitted themselves to be led astray, not only in 1952, but in 1948 as well. For there is the same continuity in USA policy as in USSR policy, whose peace crusade dates back to Stalin's time and further, just as the USA war crusade dates back to Truman's time and further. For Truman's containment policy was not only a preparation for Eisenhower's rollback policy. It had already become a rollback policy under Truman. This is now leaking out in the capitalist press itself (Allsops and Lippmann). The Korean, Formosan, Burman adventures are now clearly revealed as the aggressive acts of a peripheral war which threatened at any moment and still threatens to turn into a world holocaust.

In 1952 there was a party whose announced policy was discontinuous with Truman's war crusade. It was the Progressive Party, a peace party whose thesis was that capitalist states could exist peaceably in the same world with socialist states.

The American people turned their backs on this party and voted, as Scott Nearing puts it, a heart Ja for war, either Democratic war or Republican war.

Now it would be unfortunate if the American people should not learn a lesson from this recent experience. And certainly they will learn nothing if they remain fixed in their staring conviction that the enemy of mankind and therefor the enemy of the USA is the USSR, a power utterly ruthless, without a vestige of morality, a power with which it is useless to talk except with atom bombs.

The American people will never come out of the dead-end street of destruction, down which they are hastening, if they keep on "choosing" merely between one side of the street and the other, the Truman side or the Dewey side, the Eisenhower side or the Stevenson side. Yet we still find peace-loving liberals who believe, against all the evidence, that Adlai would have been a lesser danger than Ike. And this brings us back to the letter of James Brewer who reminds us of the kind of statesman Gov. Stevenson really is:

"No one has outstripped Stevenson in the rivalry of who-hates-the-reds-most, in stigmatizing the Soviet Union and Communism as mortal enemies of the USA. It is an amazing bill of specifications. He sees Russia as a monstrous tyranny and its purposes a threat to us of military aggression. It embodies great communist conspiracy with goal of world dominion. The home variety of communists he brands as rats and vermin. He boasts of the administration's red purge loyalty system, to be credited as its creation, as ante-dating the red-routing claims of McCarthyism.

"Communism, he asserts, major enemy of the US, has killed more minds, more souls, more decent human hopes and ambitions than any corruption—including the darkest days of Hitler. A new tyrant has been subjecting the Russian people to a slavery worse than they have ever known.

"Fervently approving the Smith 'Alien and Sedition' Act of 1940, under which Communist leaders are being prosecuted, and which is under heavy fire for repeal as having vitiated the first amendment of the Constitution, Stevenson applauds an 'absolute internal security system that has put the leaders of the Communist Party behind bars where they belong,' — catching real Communist agents being likened to 'killing poisonous snakes or tigers.' 'We despise Communism with an intensity which makes us grim with hatred toward those who gnaw at the vitals of democracy at home and abroad....But the issue is not whether Communism is evil. The issue is what are we going to do about it,' says the Governor. 'I want to pay the taxes which are the price of fighting Communism where it is spread by Russian war lords.'

"In the Foreign Affairs Quarterly of April, 1952, Stevenson said, 'The World Peace Conference is cunning evidence of Soviet duplicity.' He sneers at its chairman, the world-renowned scientist, Joliot-Curie. 'One can take almost any of the old Marxist slogans and substitute the word peace for revolution. In Soviet double-talk they mean the same.' America must play the main role, he concludes, 'in saving ourselves, our friends and civilization in the struggle against this monster,' recommending indefinite military build-up and blessing the Korean war.

"While vowing to smash the Communist conspiracy Stevenson recognizes the real source of unrest in China. Nevertheless, as one commentator puts it, he pours fire and brimstone on dissenters. He pours more elegantly than McCarthy or McCarren, but the sulphurous fumes still smell of frenzied hysteria or political hypocrisy.

"No valid anti-communist liberation movement is possible today. It is advocated on the false premise that the present status of government of the so-called behind-the-Iron-Curtain satellites is not one of revolutionary liberation in their own right.

"The proposal is not liberation but counter-liberation. To expect it to succeed in the face of the ineluctable miracle of revolution, as exemplified in the social liberation of the historic Chinese people, is the height of delusion.

"The horror of Stevenson's stark, Red-seeing phobia is that it makes for such a saturation of the already sur-charged climate of public anti-red hysterics that just consideration in the courts of communist prosecutions is practically wholly out of the question. This state of mind hardly assures a more objective approach to a settlement of the paramount issue of the cold war with Russia than would that of the militarist Republican candidate's, whom, indeed, he twits of having said he saw no reason why the Russian system of government and western democracy could not live side by side in the world; and of having in 1945 told the House Military Affairs Committee that 'Nothing guides Russian policy as much as a desire for friendship with the United States.'

"We would seem to see in Stevenson in all this the affluent, blue-blooded, aloof patrician, disposed to recoil culturally from a conciliation accomodation with lowly proletarianism, unreceptive to the Roosevelt heritage of American-Soviet friendship and negotiation, its Good Neighbor statesmanship expressed in the belated American recognition of the new Russian government."

To prove that James Brewer did not over-emphasize his point we find that even now that the election is over and there is no longer any need to compete with Eisenhower in red-baiting Gov. Stevenson goes right on with it. In This Week (3/29/53) he writes:

"We are a nation fantastically strong, with faith in our strength...impatient with road-blocks in the way of destiny, contemptuous of detours...." He says it reminds him of Wagner's string, brass and percussion "moving into a swelling symphony of unalterable purpose." This suggestion of the late impotentate of Europe becomes even stronger when, developing the idea of American physical power the Democratic leader gives utterance to the following:

"If this evidence of the unlocking of America's fabulous powers gives cause for great pride and satisfaction, that feeling rises to exultation when you realize that these powers are being directed by a united people towards great moral purposes. It is significant that the 1952 election did not turn on any little issues, that it was not dominated by partisan interests in such things as farm programs, the Taft-Hartley Act or 'tidelands oil'. The attacks which have been made upon the basic principles of Christianity and democracy by the freedom-fearing antiChrists of Communism have diverted most of us in this country from little disputes and brought us closer together as a people than ever before." And he goes on to use the now sadly familiar phrases such as "upsurging desire for great and lofty things," "a kindled passion to give freedom a fuller meaning," and so on. "History will record this as the period," he boasts, "when the torch of free world leadership was held out to America as the one nation which could keep it alive among the smothering forces of darkness."

He speaks of "carriers of Communism" as if Communism were some foul disease. "The new President," he says, "has said, in words of wisdom and courage, that the struggle

today is between nothing less than the basic forces of good and evil."

This conflict between good and evil, between light and darkness, is the basic issue before the American people, if we are to believe this voice of Whitman and Lincoln. It is the paramount duty of the American government, custodian of the light, to vanquish the Soviets, custodians of darkness.

No matter how you turn it around or dress it up, this is a policy of war, a veritable declaration of war. It is the policy of Dulles and Truman and Dewey and Stevenson. He himself has said it plainly and loudly for all to hear. The question is, will the American people listen and realize once for all that there is no difference between Tweedle-Adlai and Tweedle-Ike? And that they will never turn around and reverse their march to war by crossing over from one side of the road to the other?

This war policy is bi-partisan. Both parties adopted it after Roosevelt died, when Churchill, after checking with Baruch and Spellman, made his Fulton speech.

The Republicratic Party is a big stone around the necks of the American people. They must forge for themselves a new political instrument.

†††††††††††††

In 1928 Bishop Dibelius of East Germany, much touted by the World Council of Churches recently, wrote a letter marked confidential to the General Superintenent of the Kurmark. It said, "My dear brothers,

...We will all have not only understanding, but also full sympathy for the final motives which have given rise to the nationalist movement. Despite the ugly sound which has often attached itself to the word, I have always regarded myself as an anti-Semite. The fact cannot be concealed that the Jews have played a leading part in all the symptoms of disintegration in modern civilization...

May God bless our Easter and our Easter message.

With heartfelt greetings, yours truly,

Dibelius.

This letter was printed in John Peet's Democratic German Report, March 27, 1953.

†††††††††††††††

CHANGE OF NAME: We have tried to hitch our message to the star of Luther and Calvin. It won't do. The reformers of our day won't do either. Paul Tillich himself was here in our midst. A warm rich personality, but soft where he should be hard and hard where he should be soft. He was the guiding spirit in the enunciation of our Protestant principles. These were of value as fences to keep us out of authoritarian pastures, to tell us where not to go, but, as we remarked when setting them forth, no principles can tell us where to go. Only something that can catch the whole imagination can do that. And that something is always an act. Do not give it a capital A, because that will turn it halfway into an idea. Just as to put capitals at the beginning of every line of a rhyme won't make it poetry, so to put capitals to the pronouns of the deity is not to be necessarily religious. True religion, because it is baptized each day anew, ever seeks new garments wherewith to clothe its vision of the world's loveliness.

Our old wrong-headedness which looked on an act as something a bit vulgar, a bit below the realm of ideas and ideals where perfection dwells, that old platonic heresy clings even to the existentialist theologians. It was attacked as something false. It was false, but, worse, it was foul. Parading as softness it was the cruelest of hardness. For this brand of Christianity took and still takes bread-that-can-be-eaten from the people and gives them in its place the 'bread of life' which should be called the bread of death. And it took and still takes out of the hands of the people the painfully gathered weapons with which they try heroically to beat back the wolves in human flesh who devoured their children, telling them to think on 'higher things' and to remember the Prince of Peace. But when these same wolves drive these same people into a war the Prince of Peace is conveniently forgotten or his ministers fit him out with a suit of armor or an atom bomb.

(continued on back cover)

CLARIFYING THE NEWS

By Louise Harding

The Voters were Sold Out: At the last election for president, 79% of the people were induced to cast their votes. Eisenhower's majority was due to no small extent to his promise to bring the Korean war to an honorable conclusion and to cut taxes.

He has had it in his power, any day since his inauguration, to end the war by conforming to the Geneva Convention provision regarding prisoners of war. He has not done so and does not intend to do so. As to taxes, it is obvious that US is taking on Indo-China to a large extent. If that spells tax reduction, your scribe will eat this typewriter. Clark was back in Tokyo recently, after a visit to the Indo-China war front, and said (UP) a 'big expansion' is going on this year in the development of Vietnam forces in Indo-China. He indicated both the Americans and the French were behind this expansion.

Indo-China is by no means all that looms on the taxpayer's horizon. Seems Africa has to be looked after too according to a recent article in the San Francisco Chronicle. It is by Edwin A. Lahey and is headed, Africa is Important to US Defence. Here are a few excerpts:

The public investment of US money in Africa now runs more than half a billion dollars, and the private investment may be as much or more... Even before you leave Washington you learn not to call these flea-bitten jurisdictions colonies. Places like this are called Dots, meaning dependent overseas territories....Imperialism would also be a nasty word to describe our own expanding interest in Africa, but the list of American projects to develop the vast mineral resources of this continent suggests that the Nineteenth Century imperialism of England, France, Belgium and Portugal in Africa is child's play by comparison..... The whole business is distressingly complicated by the presence of a good many million natives, whose labor is needed for the digging, and who are clamoring with varying degrees of militancy and viciousness, to be elected to membership in the human race....

Thus Lahey. We are reminded of Nov. 1939 when Hitler said, "Today we fight for oil fields, rubber, treasures of the earth." He realized there were slight obstacles in the way of grabbing these however. "The history of all times ...has proved that every space expansion can only be effected by breaking resistance...Neither formerly nor today has space been found without an owner; that attacker always comes up against the proprietor."

—Adolf doesn't mention the possibility, as does newswriter Lahey, that you can force the owners of coveted resources to go to work for you (at slave wages).

Beams in Their Eyes: In Britain we hear there is complaint because the rebellious dispossessed in Kenya in their revolt are killing "men, women and children alike." And what are the British helping the United States to do in Korea? In Northern France they keep intact the ruins of a town that was demolished by Hitler with the massacre of its inhabitants. The French go to visit it and to renew their hatred for the Nazi gangsters. But in Korea the French help to do precisely the same thing.

Franco Admires USA: Speaking for the Dictator, Francisco Franco, in an interview not long ago with an American newspaperman, a Spanish official said: "We greatly admire Americans —even though we find them childlike. But in Spain we are very fond of children.....We are particularly fond of your American Government now that it it is entering a more dynamic phase. We like it." Dynamic is the word Dulles loves so much. Isn't it nice that Franco and his followers approve of the US as run by the Du Ponts, Rockefellers, Morgan, Dulles with his I.G. Farben connections, and so on. Thomas J. Hamilton, a competent newspaperman, wrote an important book, "Appeasement's Child" in which he told how Franco "crowed over the Nazi successes as if they had been his own."

And now this bloody Franco approves of the present regime in the United States. What a disgrace! Nothing more is needed to show the depths to which this country has sunk.

Storm Signals: Recently, as reported in the press, Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, former law minister in Nehru's cabinet and a leading spokesman of India's 60 million untouchables, said in an interview that the caste government of India is literally driving the untouchables and 50 million aboriginal tribesmen into the arms of communism. He said he had not yet decided

what to advise his followers, "but generally speaking I am convinced communism will be the only way out for us and probably for all India."

If the Dulles line is to be followed, that any other country going Communist and thus contributing to the 'economic encirclement' of the USA is to be considered grounds for warring on Russia, it certainly seems there are storm signals ahead.

Nazis Ready to Fight for Democracy: Konrad Adenauer has just been and gone. He is the outstanding democrat who according to the Berlin National Zeitung (1/25/51), which was uncontradicted as far as your correspondent knows, connived with Eisenhower to prohibit under any circumstances a plebiscite in West Germany on rearmament. US Military Information authorities agreed that 85% of the West Germans were opposed.

On March 16 of this year the Wall Street Journal ran a leading article on the German plan for mobilization. It begins:

> Bonn— "When Europe is ready, we Germans are ready." So says Adolf Heusinger, the man who is all prepared to put a new West German army into uniform, train it, and if necessary send it into battle on the side of the West. Once he was chief of operations planning for Hitler's wehrmacht. Today ex-General Heusinger has a similar job in a corner at no. 27 Emerkeil Strasse. That's headquarters for West Germany's embryo defense department, known here as the Bureau Blank. For over a year it has been drawing up detailed plans for West Germany's 450,000 contribution to the European army. Herr Heusinger's plans are now complete. All that's needed is a green light from the Western allies.

—But before the Nazi officers are willing to follow any such green light there are some considerations to be taken into account. These have to do with the return of the Saar to Germany and the pushing back of the Soviets toward the East, beyond the Oder-Neisse. The WSJ article continues with a statement that

> within 24 hours after all six member nations ratify the European army treaty—assuming it is eventually ratified—a conscription bill will be introduced in the West German parliament to bring upwards of 300,000 draftees into uniform.
>
> (The officers are to be Nazis.)
>
> A standard German barrack has been designed. Model camps have been blueprinted and contractors alerted.
>
> (The fact that IG Farben is busy making poison gas is not mentioned.)

This war bureau is named Bureau Blank after Theodor Blank who is civilian chief of the agency...."an independent group financed from Chancellor Konrad Adenauer's executive office funds."

Germany now has a law against 'treason' under which anyone who opposes remilitarization and conscription can be given sentences of five to fifteen years at hard labor. "Die Zeit", a conservative paper of Hamburg, said of this law:

"The paragraph was, however, not invented by the Federal Parliament. It originated in spirit in an emergency regulation issued by President Hindenburg on Dec. 8th., 1931, supplemented by Hitler's Heimtucke Gesetz of 1934."

The Coburg "Neue Presse" said of this law:

"It is impossible to avoid seeing that the whole proceeding has a devilish resemblance to nazi law-making which under the general title of 'endangering the state' issued the regulation for the protection of people and state....and the Heimtucke Gesetz (Dec. 1934)."

Theodor Blank is a trade union leader. Thus we see the reactionary labor leaders of Germany willing to use nazi laws to drive the German youth into enforced service in an imperialistic war. They are of the same strain as the Atlees of England and the Reuthers of the USA, who are used by Monopoly Capital to break down the effective resistance offered by a united labor movement.

In case France will not go along with these war plans, then, says the Wall Street Journal: "This doesnt necessarily mean that the elaborate preparations of the Bureau Blank will have gone for nought. If a German force is not incorporated in a unified continental army, it is possible the US will then insist that a separate German army be created as part of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization....."

(Continued from page 7)

Thus we have noted how in 1950 the International Missionary Council, instead of denouncing the US-UN aggression against the Korean people, sent Korean Christians its 'acute concern' and 'prayers', and how the World Council of Churches (take away its millionaire supporters and it would melt like snow on a hot stove) commended the rump UN Security Council for putting its initials on that same aggression. And now they tell us in their *Emergency Communique* (EPS 3/4/53) that "the agony of Korea surpasses imagination." But they repent of nothing.

We have watched these churchmen praise the "revolution of the common man" and, when the common man actually *revoluted,* turn their backs of him, wash their hands of him, or pass resolutions against him.

We have never tried to speak for organized religion, but have tried to speak *to* organized religion, interpreting as best we could the intention of Jesus with respect to our time.

Any phrase or word, even 'Incarnation' or 'Christ' *may* become an obstacle rather than a help to the actual incarnation in us of the spirit of Jesus. Jesus once said it was expedient that he leave his disciples. So today it may be expedient for some of the phrases of which we have emptied the meaning to be removed from us. At any rate we continue our work under a new name: ONE.

There is not more than *one* way to answer moral questions. There is *one* God, *one* history, *one* man, *one* world.

With this change we keep and somewhat broaden our religious reference. We shall continue to call upon Christianity to rise to the challenge of the communal life that is sweeping the East. We shall keep on praying that Christianity may rise in fact to the level of its own Christ who is the real leader of world revolution.

ONE magazine is published monthly by New Christian Books, 69 Inglis Street, Halifax, Nova Scotia. By subscription only. 12 issues $3.00. Checks and money orders payable to **New Christian Books.**

ONE

magazine

(Formerly The Protestant)

MAY 1953 Edited by Kenneth Leslie

"We shall hitch our wagon to the Star of Bethlehem."
John Tunnicliffe

THE VORTEX

WHO SHALL HELP THE PEOPLE?

CLARIFYING THE NEWS

By Louise Harding

CHANGE OF NAME

...Forward as a haughty host they tread.
A starved mongrel shambles in the rear.
Bearing high the banner, bloody red,
That He holds in hands no bullets sear—
Hidden as the flying snow veils veer,
Lightly walking on the wind, as though
He Himself were diamonded snow,
With mist-white roses garlanded:
Jesus Christ is marching at their head.

—Alexander Blok

Vol. IX No. 7 25 cents